an opposition to the plaintiffs' motion to consolidate had just been filed earlier in the day, prior to the conference. Defense counsel also informed the Court that the plaintiffs had not responded to the motion to dismiss and that, pursuant to the Court's Local Rules, the time for the plaintiffs to file an opposition had already expired. Defense counsel stated that they would soon file the appropriate documents formally informing the Court of this failure to oppose and asking the Court to file in favor of the motion to dismiss. Ms. Lynch stated that she would file a response.

The Magistrate Judge and counsel then went over the filing deadlines and hearing dates in each party's proposed Scheduling Order, and, where the parties had previously disagreed, settled on certain dates. Rather than adopt the Proposed Scheduling Order submitted to the Court by the defendants on May 18, 2004, the parties agreed to draft a new Proposed Scheduling Order, which will include the newly agreed-upon dates for filing deadlines and hearings.

After reaching agreement on dates and deadlines in the Scheduling Order, Ms. Limtiaco notified Ms. Lynch that the originals of some documents served via facsimile were never received by her law office. In response, Ms. Lynch stated that the originals should have been sent and that she would look into the matter.

The Magistrate Judge and counsel also discussed the procedure regarding a proposed Discovery Plan, which the parties had been ordered to file by May 18, 2004. Since defense counsel submitted such a Plan, albeit on May 19, 2004, the Court and counsel agreed that such compliance was all that was required, and that the Court and counsel did not have to sign the Plan.

The conference concluded at 4:50 P.M.

Dated: June 3, 2004

DELIA S. ŁÚJAN Pro Se Law Clerk